



City of Seattle

Department of Planning and Development
Diane M. Sugimura, Director

**CITY OF SEATTLE
ANALYSIS, RECOMMENDATION AND DECISION OF THE DIRECTOR OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Application Number: 3012694
Applicant Name: Steve Yoon
Address of Proposal: 3635 Woodland Park Avenue North

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTIONS

Land Use Application to allow a four story, residential building with 167 residential units, four live/work units and 133 parking stalls. Review includes 22,500 cubic yards of grading.

The following approvals are required:

Design Review - Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Section 23.41

SEPA - Environmental Determination pursuant to SMC 25.05

SEPA DETERMINATION: ☐ Exempt ☐ DNS ☐ MDNS ☐ EIS

☒ DNS with conditions*

☐ DNS involving non-exempt grading or demolition or
involving another agency with jurisdiction.

* Notice of the Early Determination of Non-significance was published on July 26, 2012.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant proposes to design and construct a residential building with 167 residential units, four live/work units and 133 parking spaces. The proposed demolition would remove several commercial and residential structures.

The applicant initially provided three unembellished massing concepts. Commonalities included introducing six to seven live/work units (to capture the higher floor area ratio) at the base, a single garage entrance off Woodland Park Ave. N, residential units at grade and on three floors above grade. Each scheme steps the mass along the descending slope. Scheme A carves a linear courtyard into the center of the building mass the length of the development site creating two long rectilinear bars flanking the open space. On the Woodland Park Ave side, the volume contains units extended along a double loaded corridor---one side facing the courtyard and the other the street. This scheme steps down once at the mid-point of the long axis. The floors of each of the live/work units and the flanking apartment units appear to meet the grade along Woodland Park Ave. The narrower volume facing Albion Place is single loaded. On this side of the complex, the units closest to grade do not appear to always meet grade.

Concept B shifts the live/work units to Albion Place and carves three deep courtyards fronting Woodland Park which steps up from grade as they approach the center of the site. These establish four wings extending from the central longitudinal axis and provide light into these clusters of units. On the Albion side, the massing has slight vertical setbacks or insets (housing balconies?) for the entire length of the development site. Similar to Concept A, the building steps down near the site's mid-point. The final concept diagram places the open space in the form of two courtyards on the Albion Pl. side. At the residential levels, three, four-story wings extend from the larger north/south rectangular mass that houses units along a double loaded corridor. Above the live/work units facing Woodland Park, the architect implies a series of linear terraces or balconies that steadily step up the grade as the mass approaches the north. These sliding bars (at least in mass) emphasize the horizontality or linearity of the site. The step in the building mass for this scenario occurs once as well.

The applicant's submitted scheme for the 2nd EDG resembled in massing the earlier Concept C in which three flanking four-story residential wings embrace two courtyards facing Albion Place. The larger bulk of the building mass fronts onto Woodland Park Ave. with a series of repeating bays. Two live/work units astride a slightly recessed residential entrance at mid-block. Vehicular entry and exit would occur close to the south property line where the site's declivity is lowest. Drawings illustrate a series of stoops lining much of Woodland Park Ave.

By the Recommendation meeting, the applicant had made considerable refinements to the design to comply with city staff and Board guidance. The architect presented these changes at the meeting on November 5th.

SITE & VICINITY

Located in the Fremont Hub Urban Village, the large rectangular site lies within a Commercial One (C 1) zone with a 40 foot height limit. The terrain's declension, roughly 22 feet, occurs from northwest to southeast. The site includes surface parking, an industrial facility, an apartment building, an office structure and a single family residence. The site has no mapped environmentally critical areas (ECA).

The farrago of building styles and uses that characterize the neighborhood provides one of its most interesting qualities. The narrow avenues also lend an intimacy to this portion of Fremont. Woodland Park Ave N. possesses a mix of commercial structures, both office and industrial, smaller brick apartment buildings and older single family houses. An interesting office building (1960) with a folded plate roof and a concrete screen anchors the southeast corner of Woodland Park and N. 38th St. On the southern portion of the west side of Woodland Park, an apartment building has recently been completed. MUP application (3013012) with 60 rooms within four attached congregate residences and no parking is currently being reviewed. Another project with 51 units on the east side of Woodland Park near N. 36th St. is under construction.

Along Albion Pl., apartment buildings, newer townhouses and a contemporary single family residence line the west side of this unimproved street. The ages of the buildings in the neighborhood range from the early 20th century to a recently constructed 17 unit apartment building two parcels south of the site. The topography ascends east to west. The buildings on the west side of Albion sit higher on the slope than the buildings to the east. The area lies within close proximity to the Stone Way N. commercial corridor and the center of the Fremont neighborhood.

ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

Public Comments

At the first EDG meeting, approximately 29 people affixed their names to the Early Design Review meeting sign-in sheet. They raised the following issues:

Height, Bulk and Scale

- The proposed height of the building fronting on Albion Pl. is too high.
- The proposal should respond to the change in zoning across Albion Pl.
- The overall massing is excessive. Scale down the size of the building.
- The scale is out of proportion.
- View blockage is a concern. (Comment repeated.)
- Due to the change from one zone to a much less intensive zone across Albion Pl, the building should have reduced height and mass on Albion.
- Reduce the building mass.
- The project is far larger than anything else previously built or proposed. It is way out of scale.

Traffic/Parking

- Traffic and parking is already maxed out in the area. (Comment repeated several times.)
- The proposal does not provide enough parking.
- With one garage exit, 130 vehicles will be shining their lights on the neighbors across the street.
- The single garage will generate safety issues for pedestrians. There are many pedestrians in the neighborhood.
- Adequate on-street parking is a huge problem on Woodland Park Ave.
- Woodland serves as a thoroughfare with speeding cars and unsafe conditions.

- Characterizing the neighborhood as having access to good transit is false. The bus stops are crowded.
- The one garage produces a less safe pedestrian environment than if there were two garage entrances.

Neighborhood Quality

- Both Albion and Woodland Park are quaint, pleasant streets.
- The quality of the streetscape relates to old style Fremont.
- Woodland Park Ave. once served as a trolley line.
- Significant buildings are located on the east side of Woodland Park.
- The project will create a canyon on Albion Pl.

Noise

- With the addition of two other new projects, there will be a total of 300 new units in the neighborhood. The noise will be disruptive to a presently quiet neighborhood.
- Limit the use of the roof in order to prevent noise and height (no need for building parapets).

Landscaping

- Intensively planted street trees are encouraged.

Miscellaneous

- Ensure that the dumpsters remain hidden from the streets.

Seven people signed-in at the 2nd EDG meeting. The speakers raised the following issues:

- This is a massive project. It will be the second largest residential building in the Fremont area.
- Consider reducing the height of the structure as the zoning changes in density across Albion Place N.
- Don't install a roof deck. The neighborhood is quiet and the noise from parties on the deck carries easily. (Mentioned by several speakers.)
- The maritime theme is totally out of context with the neighborhood.
- The structures on Woodland Park Ave are made of brick and wood clapboard.
- Heavy timber and metal is out of context. Carol Tobin's historic building survey reveals this discordant idea.
- Preserve the copious landscaping and tree canopy on Albion Pl.
- The proposal is too massive. It is huge! There are mostly small residential buildings in the area.
- The building should be one-story lower.
- The mechanical and other penthouses will block views.

Letters and emails received by DPD discussed the impacts of noise, on-street parking, view blockage, and lack of sunlight produced by the proposal.

GUIDELINES

After visiting the site, considering the analysis of the site and context provided by the proponent, and hearing public comment, the Design Review Board members provided the siting and design guidance described below and identified highest priority by letter and number from the guidelines found in the City of Seattle’s “Design Review: Guidelines for Multi-family and Commercial Buildings”.

PRIORITIES

A	Site Planning
----------	----------------------

- A-1 Responding to Site Characteristics. The siting of buildings should respond to specific site conditions and opportunities such as non-rectangular lots, location on prominent intersections, unusual topography, significant vegetation and views or other natural features.**

Future design concepts and any refinement of the previous ones should place greater emphasis on expressing the sloping terrain in built form. This will also assist in dividing the large mass into more discrete units. (January 23, 3012)

Issues of scale are discussed in B-1 guidance. (May 7, 2012)

- A-2 Streetscape Compatibility. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.**

The intimacy of the narrow streets should be reflected in the scale of the building particularly at street level. At the next EDG meeting, an overall concept plan for will need to illustrate streetscape improvements. (January 23, 3012)

The applicant provided sketches of the improvements along the rights of way. More precise plan and section drawings will be required for the Recommendation meeting. (May 7, 2012)

- A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street. Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.**

See Board guidance for C-3, D-1, and D-12. (January 23, 3012)

The Board did not elaborate on this issue at the 2nd EDG meeting. (May 7, 2012)

- A-4 Human Activity. New development should be sited and designed to encourage human activity on the street.**

The Board noted this guideline as an important consideration. (January 23, 3012)

The perspective drawings on pp. 15 and 18 convinced the Board of the architect’s intention to engage the at-grade units with the streetscape. (May 7, 2012)

- A-5 Respect for Adjacent Sites. Buildings should respect adjacent properties by being located on their sites to minimize disruption of the privacy and outdoor activities of residents in adjacent buildings.**

Office and industrial uses lie to the north and south respectively of the project site. Discussion of height, bulk and scale by the Board applied to the proposal’s relationship to the residential buildings across Albion Place and Woodland Park Ave. (January 23, 3012)

Acknowledging this important consideration, the Board did not add to the earlier guidance. (May 7, 2012)

- A-6 Transition Between Residence and Street. For residential projects, the space between the building and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and encourage social interaction among residents and neighbors.**

The Board noted that it liked the direction of the efforts on Woodland Park Ave as presented at the 2nd EDG meeting. (May 7, 2012)

- A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.**

Development of the courtyard concepts (particularly, Options B and C) would begin to comply with this guideline. (January 23, 3012)

The resulting rooftop deck design should include acoustic techniques to dampen or baffle sounds emanating from the roof. The deck's orientation, structures and materials will be scrutinized. (May 7, 2012)

- A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.**

Recognizing the public's skepticism about a single garage access, the Board requested a valid argument for preferring one access point as opposed to two. (January 23, 3012)

The Board noted its preference for single garage access on the southern portion of Woodland Park Ave. N. (May 7, 2012)

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

- B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.**

All three massing concepts yielded a scale much larger in appearance than anything in the neighborhood. Without much of the neighborhood context placed in the schematic presentations, the masses appeared overwhelming. The Board expressed some level of comfort with the strategy of locating two larger courts facing Albion Pl. as shown in Concept B. To provide a sense of human scale, the next iteration should indicate, according to the Board's directive, unit entrances and stoops along Albion Place and within the courtyards. This will better connect the project with the streetscape and begin to assume a greater sensitivity to human scale and activity.

The ideas diagramed for Concept C's Woodland Park side appeared inchoate and less satisfactory to the Board. The extruded trays or shelves along the front emphasized the site's horizontality and its massiveness. The Albion side with its repetition of open spaces and division of building mass had more appeal. The Board requested an alternative concept "D" inspired by the more compelling elements of concepts B and C. The mass should begin to step back, perhaps, at the upper levels from Albion Pl. and begin to form discreet volumes which create a series of steps as the topography descends. (January 23, 3012)

The Board devoted considerable discussion to the massing along Woodland Park Ave. The architect's preferred approach---a series of repeating bays (A,B,C,B,A)---contrasts with an alternative approach of a single structure organized to suggest two to three different volumes (similar to the architect's design at Stone Way N. and N. 40th St.). Done well these approaches could begin to diminish the building's bulk. The Board did not favor one approach over the other only requesting that the architect make a compelling visual argument for their choice. The emphasis for either design strategy should be directed to reducing the building's apparent bulk.

The massing along Albion Ave. N. appeared satisfactory. (May 7, 2012)

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

- C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.**

Discounting Concept A as unrealistic, the Board conveyed that some elements of the other concept diagrams bore strong architectural ideas (the courtyards) but that other ideas appeared less successful, warranting rethinking of the approach. This appeared especially true of Concept C's Woodland Park massing. A new alternative would either knit together some of the more positive notions or formulate a new parti.

It is important to convey how the proposal relates to its context. The Board members conveyed their doubts as to whether the project team understood the neighborhood. (January 23, 3012)

The Board urged the architect to eliminate the gable-like parapets facing Woodland Park Ave. and the assortment of roof forms on Albion Pl. These elements add height and offer little substance to the design. This guideline remains an important consideration as design development occurs. (May 7, 2012)

- C-3 Human Scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.**

The nature of the diagrammatic modeling (generally condoned by DPD), as illustrated in the design packet, lacks a sensitivity to human scale. The designers should convey their cognizance of the human scale in the next iteration. The units facing the courts and the streets on Albion Pl. ought to enliven the streetscape. Doors, stoops, windows and decks would communicate an interest in the larger community that surrounds the development. Later in design development the details of these elements and others (e.g. stairs, gates, finishes and landscaping) will convey how well the proposal wishes to embrace its neighborhood. (January 23, 3012)

The sketches (on pp.15 and 18) of the building's relationship to the streetscape show sensitivity to the appropriate human scale. The Board encouraged the evolution of the design in this direction. (May 7, 2012)

- C-4 Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.**

The quality of the finish materials will become more important as the design evolves. How these materials are detailed should reflect a strong architectural concept. (January 23, 3012)

The Board reiterated the earlier comments. (May 7, 2012)

C-5 Structured Parking Entrances. The presence and appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building.

At the next EDG meeting, the architect will need to provide a study illustrating the garage's relationship to and its impact upon the neighboring residential buildings. (January 23, 3012)

See A-8 guidance. (May 7, 2012)

D. Pedestrian Environment

D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.

The series of courtyards embody a strong urban design concept that would be enriched by the placement of unit entrances and well designed landscaping to reinforce the building's relationship to the life of the surrounding community. (January 23, 3012)

Compose the rooftop deck of discrete open spaces to reduce the incentive for the tenants to organize large gatherings.

The design of the courtyards (p. 18) on Albion Pl. N. suggests the primary users will be the tenants whose apartments have direct access. Due to the sunken floor of the south courtyard, the circulation from Albion Pl. would consume a considerable portion of the occupiable space. (May 7, 2012)

D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures. The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.

The concept diagrams suggest a large garage opening and the potentiality of blank walls flanking it. A successful approach to minimizing the scale of the garage and its impacts will be an important consideration during the next reviews. (January 23, 3012)

The architect should make an effort at reducing the scale of the garage opening. (May 7, 2012)

D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.

Given the potential size of the service area(s), the location and operation are important considerations. At the next presentation, conveyance of this architect's approach to this aspect of the program will need to be displayed. (January 23, 3012)

At the Recommendation meeting, the architect will need to show how the service areas function. (May 7, 2012)

D-7 Personal Safety and Security. Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.

As the design evolves, the architects should consider exterior lighting and security for the open spaces next to the streets and at the residential entries. A concept landscape plan will convey the designer's cognizance of this important element. (January 23, 3012)

The earlier guidance continues to apply. (May 7, 2012)

D-11 Commercial Transparency. Commercial storefronts should be transparent, allowing for a direct visual connection between pedestrians on the sidewalk and the activities occurring on the interior of a building. Blank walls should be avoided.

In plan and in three dimensional diagram, the live/work units appear as just more dwelling units within the larger residential complex. The next iteration should communicate a larger idea for the commercial uses. As the Board suggested, the programming of live/work units supplies the development with an increased floor area ratio. This acts to expand the bulk and mass of the structure, which as the Board noted, already appears quite extensive. (January 23, 3012)

The Board liked the preliminary exterior design of the live/work spaces along Woodland Park Ave N. (May 7, 2012)

D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions. For residential projects in commercial zones, the space between the residential entry and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and a visually interesting street front for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops and other elements that work to create a transition between the public sidewalk and private entry.

The Board discussed whether the building's identity rests on programming a single, formal residential entry or the possibility of creating a series of entries. Utilizing the latter strategy would begin to reduce the scale of the proposal by complementing the idea of producing discrete massing elements within a larger complex. The entries, the design of the walkways and the landscaping would help establish a human scale. (January 23, 3012)

This guidance continues to remain of high importance. (May 7, 2012)

E. Landscaping

E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.

As design development occurs, the Board will review the landscape concept. At the next EDG meeting, a concept landscape plan will need to be presented. (January 23, 3012)

The color renderings of the proposed landscaping in the 2nd EDG booklet appealed to the Board members. (May 7, 2012)

MASTER USE PERMIT APPLICATION

The applicant revised the design and applied for a Master Use Permit with a Design Review and SEPA components on July 28, 2012.

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION

The Design Review Board conducted a Final Recommendation Meeting on November 5, 2012 to review the applicant's formal project proposal developed in response to the previously identified priorities. At the public meetings, site plans, elevations, floor plans, landscaping plans, and computer renderings of the proposed exterior materials were presented for the Board members' consideration.

Public Comments

Seven people affixed their names to the Recommendation meeting sign-in sheet. The speakers praised the sophistication of the Albion Place N. façade, the closed courtyards, the minimization of headlight glare from the garage, and how the roof deck's design mitigates sound. However, the massive Woodland Park Ave façade with its lack of affinity to the original fabric of this part of Fremont warrants reworking. Colors should be judiciously used to break-up the façade's massing but the bright red and yellow accent colors are a poor choice as they lack timeless qualities. The speakers endorsed the departure requests.

A Site Planning

A-2 Streetscape Compatibility. The siting of buildings should acknowledge and reinforce the existing desirable spatial characteristics of the right-of-way.

At the previous EDG meeting, the Board requested more precise drawings illustrating the rights of way conditions. The applicant provided these. The Board's ensuing deliberation did not focus on this issue.

A-3 Entrances Visible from the Street. Entries should be clearly identifiable and visible from the street.

Unconvinced by the prosaic character of the metal canopy and its relationship to the larger three-story glulam frame surrounding the primary residential entrance, the Board urged the architect to reconsider the design by adopting one or more strategies by raising the canopy, increasing the amount of transparency, and revising its scale and shape. The canopy does not sit well with the larger glulam frame. Eliminating the canopy may also suffice.

A-7 Residential Open Space. Residential projects should be sited to maximize opportunities for creating usable, attractive, well-integrated open space.

Responding to earlier guidance, the landscape architect redesigned the roof deck to minimize sound by distancing the roof deck from both Albion Place and Woodland Ave, proposing a series of hedges and other vegetation to provide sound barriers, and forming a series of three small gathering spaces rather than one larger area. The Board accepted these changes.

- A-8 Parking and Vehicle Access. Siting should minimize the impact of automobile parking and driveways on the pedestrian environment, adjacent properties, and pedestrian safety.**

Insertion of an amenity area above the vehicular entrance within the glulam frame that defines the larger mass of the garage serves to reduce the appearance of the garage opening.

B. Height, Bulk and Scale

- B-1 Height, Bulk, and Scale Compatibility. Projects should be compatible with the scale of development anticipated by the applicable Land Use Policies for the surrounding area and should be sited and designed to provide a sensitive transition to near-by, less intensive zones. Projects on zone edges should be developed in a manner that creates a step in perceived height, bulk, and scale between anticipated development potential of the adjacent zones.**

The Woodland Park façade reads as one very long building. It possesses a clear rhythm (A,B,C,B,A) with the smaller repeating “B” segment connecting the larger masses. Yet, the façade’s frenetic changes in materials, multiplicity of colors, and unresolved use of glulams produce an unsettled quality. Intended to reduce the overall mass, this design strategy results in a heightened sense of visual agitation. The Board members offered several ways of thinking about the elevation including reducing the number of colors and consolidating colors. Certainly, the selection of colors does not have to mimic the rhythm or cadence of the major façade elements. Elements A and C, for example, may have similar color combinations and the second “A” volume could have a complementary color variation. The bright red and yellow doors and canopies lacked sophistication. The Board urged elimination of these colors for hues complementary to the proposal’s predominant earth tones.

In the transition from EDG to Recommendation meetings, the use of the glulam lost its structural and visual *raison d’être*. The glulams became either relegated to the appearance of trim or were eliminated. The architect should reassert this element of the design (see pp. 12, 13 and 15 of the Recommendation booklet appendix) which anchors the design to the historic maritime and industrial buildings of Fremont. In essence, give the glulams purpose by allowing them to express their architectonic character.

The Board applauded the Albion elevation’s possession of restraint and sophistication.

C. Architectural Elements and Materials

- C-2 Architectural Concept and Consistency. Building design elements, details and massing should create a well-proportioned and unified building form and exhibit an overall architectural concept. Buildings should exhibit form and features identifying the functions within the building. In general, the roofline or top of the structure should be clearly distinguished from its facade walls.**

The Board praised the design of the Albion Place façade complimenting both its color palette and the manner in which the courtyards help organize it.

The Woodland Park Ave. elevation has too many changes at the same rate across the façade. Pare the Woodland Park elevation down to its essence. Reassert the façade’s strong organization by consolidating (and eliminating colors), revising the metal canopy at the primary residential entrance, and strengthening the visual presence of the glulams. See guidance for B-1.

- C-3 Human Scale. The design of new buildings should incorporate architectural features, elements, and details to achieve a good human scale.**

The Board did not expand upon earlier comments from the EDG meetings.

- C-4 Exterior Finish Materials. Building exteriors should be constructed of durable and maintainable materials that are attractive even when viewed up close. Materials that have texture, pattern, or lend themselves to a high quality of detailing are encouraged.**

The placement of the glulams should have the same or similar architectonic presence as the architect introduced at the second EDG meeting. See B-1 guidance.

- C-5 Structured Parking Entrances. The presence and appearance of garage entrances should be minimized so that they do not dominate the street frontage of a building. See Guidance A-8.**

D. Pedestrian Environment

- D-1 Pedestrian Open Spaces and Entrances. Convenient and attractive access to the building's entry should be provided. To ensure comfort and security, paths and entry areas should be sufficiently lighted and entry areas should be protected from the weather. Opportunities for creating lively, pedestrian-oriented open space should be considered.**

See Guidance A-7 for discussion of the roof deck.

The Board accepted the private character of the two courtyards on Albion Place N. and did not recommend modifications.

- D-5 Visual Impacts of Parking Structures. The visibility of all at-grade parking structures or accessory parking garages should be minimized. The parking portion of a structure should be architecturally compatible with the rest of the structure and streetscape. Open parking spaces and carports should be screened from the street and adjacent properties.**

Earlier guidance asked the architect to reduce the scale of the garage opening. The designer accomplished this by inserting an amenity area above the garage to reduce the opening's height by nearly a floor.

- D-6 Screening of Dumpsters, Utilities, and Service Areas. Building sites should locate service elements like trash dumpsters, loading docks and mechanical equipment away from the street front where possible. When elements such as dumpsters, utility meters, mechanical units and service areas cannot be located away from the street front, they should be situated and screened from view and should not be located in the pedestrian right-of-way.**

Solid waste storage occurs in the garage. On pick-up days, the dumpsters will be conveyed to the garage entry area.

- D-7 Personal Safety and Security. Project design should consider opportunities for enhancing personal safety and security in the environment under review.**

The Board did not comment upon the concept lighting plan.

- D-11 Commercial Transparency. Commercial storefronts should be transparent, allowing for a direct visual connection between pedestrians on the sidewalk and the activities occurring on the interior of a building. Blank walls should be avoided.**

The Board observed that the fenestration for the live/work units resembled the residential windows. The Board recommended revising the fenestration pattern, citing a preference for the drawings shown at the previous EDG meeting. The windows should signify that the live/work spaces are commercial in nature.

- D-12 Residential Entries and Transitions. For residential projects in commercial zones, the space between the residential entry and the sidewalk should provide security and privacy for residents and a visually interesting street front for pedestrians. Residential buildings should enhance the character of the streetscape with small gardens, stoops and other elements that work to create a transition between the public sidewalk and private entry.**

The design has a primary residential entry centered along the Woodland Park façade. A canted, three story glulam frame signifies this entrance. A series of residential units have discrete entrances setback modestly from the front property line to provide a small porch or stoop. Some of these units lie a few feet below sidewalk grade. Four live/work astride the larger primary residential entry. These units sit proud of the residential units and the entry lobby.

E. Landscaping

- E-2 Landscaping to Enhance the Building and/or Site. Landscaping, including living plant material, special pavements, trellises, screen walls, planters, site furniture, and similar features should be appropriately incorporated into the design to enhance the project.**

The Board liked the overall landscape design. Due to the landscape architect's vagueness about the type of planters, the Board recommended that the planner review and approve the type of containers on the roof garden. In keeping with the project's high quality of design, the containers should not use the large metal planters that resemble horse troughs.

Board Recommendations: The recommendations summarized below were based on the plans submitted at the November 5th, 2012 meeting. Design, siting or architectural details not specifically identified or altered in these recommendations are expected to remain as presented in the plans and other drawings available at the November 5th public meeting. After considering the site and context, hearing public comment, reconsidering the previously identified design priorities, and reviewing the plans and renderings, the four Design Review Board members present unanimously recommended approval of the subject design and the requested development standard departures from the requirements of the Land Use Code (listed below).

STANDARD	REQUIREMENT	REQUEST	JUSTIFICATION	RECOMMEND- ATION
1 Street Level Facade SMC 23.47A.008A.3	Street level street facing facades shall be located within 10' of the street lot line, unless wider sidewalks, plazas, or other approved landscape or open spaces are provided.	Entry is set back 20' from property line.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows a centrally located pedestrian oriented plaza at the primary entrance. Provides significant modulation along the length of a long elevation to reduce the building mass. 	Recommended Approval
2. Non-residential street level requirements SMC 23.47A.008B.3.b	Non-residential uses shall have a floor to floor height of at least 13'.	Insertion of a mezzanine at a height of 10' to define the residential area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20' overall height of live/work exceeds the 13' and defines the commercial area. 	Recommended Approval

The Board recommended the following **CONDITIONS** for the project. (Authority referenced in the letter and number in parenthesis):

1. Revise the metal canopy that sits above the primary residential entry. The land use planner has the responsibility to review and approve changes to the design in keeping with Board guidance. (A-3)
2. Pare the Woodland Park elevation down to its essence. Reassert the façade's strong organization by consolidating (and eliminating colors), revising the metal canopy at the primary residential entrance, and strengthening the visual presence of the glulams. The land use planner has the responsibility to review and approve changes to the design in keeping with Board guidance. (B-1, C-2, C-4)
3. Revise the fenestration for the live/work units in order to visually emphasize the commercial nature of these units. The glazing should not resemble the residential units. Refer to the appendix of the Recommendation packet (p. 13) for the previous design. The land use planner has the responsibility to review and approve changes to the design in keeping with Board guidance. (D-11)
4. In keeping with the project's high quality of design, the landscape containers on the roof garden should be of a high quality. Do not use the large metal planters that resemble horse troughs. The land use planner will review and approve the selection of planters.

DIRECTOR'S ANALYSIS - DESIGN REVIEW

The Director finds no conflicts with SEPA requirements or state or federal laws, and has reviewed the City-wide Design Guidelines and finds that the Board neither exceeded its authority nor applied the guidelines inconsistently in the approval of this design. The Director agrees with the conditions recommended by the four Board members and the recommendation to approve the design, as stated above.

DECISION - DESIGN REVIEW

The proposed design is **CONDITIONALLY GRANTED**.

ANALYSIS - SEPA

The initial disclosure of the potential impacts from this project was made in the environmental checklist submitted by the applicant dated June 26, 2012. The information in the checklist, project plans, and the experience of the lead agency with review of similar projects form the basis for this analysis and decision. The SEPA Overview Policy (SMC 25.05.665 D) clarifies the relationship between codes, policies, and environmental review. Specific policies for each element of the environment, certain neighborhood plans and other policies explicitly referenced may serve as the basis for exercising substantive SEPA authority.

The Overview Policy states in part: "where City regulations have been adopted to address an environmental impact, it shall be presumed that such regulations are adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation" (subject to some limitations). Under certain limitations and/or circumstances (SMC 25.05.665 D 1-7) mitigation can be considered. Thus, a more detailed discussion of some of the impacts is appropriate.

Short-term Impacts

Construction activities could result in the following adverse impacts: construction dust and storm water runoff, erosion, emissions from construction machinery and vehicles, increased particulate levels, increased noise levels, occasional disruption of adjacent vehicular and pedestrian traffic, a small increase in traffic and parking impacts due to construction related vehicles, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Several construction-related impacts are mitigated by existing City codes and ordinances applicable to the project such as: the Noise Ordinance, the Stormwater Grading and Drainage Control Code, the Street Use Ordinance, and the Building Code. The following is an analysis of construction-related noise, air quality, earth, grading, construction impacts, traffic and parking impacts as well as its mitigation.

Noise

Noise associated with construction of the mixed use building and future phases could adversely affect surrounding uses in the area, which include residential and commercial uses. Surrounding uses are likely to be adversely impacted by noise throughout the duration of construction activities. Due to the proximity of the project site to residential uses, the limitations of the Noise Ordinance are found to be inadequate to mitigate the potential noise impacts.

Pursuant to the SEPA Overview Policy (SMC.25.05.665) and the SEPA Construction Impacts Policy (SMC 25.05.675 B), mitigation is warranted.

Prior to issuance of demolition, grading and building permits, the applicant will submit a construction noise mitigation plan. This plan will include steps 1) to limit noise decibel levels and duration and 2) procedures for advanced notice to surrounding properties. The plan will be subject to review and approval by DPD. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be limited to the following:

- 1) Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
- 2) Non-holiday weekdays between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
- 3) Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.

- 4) Emergencies or work which must be done to coincide with street closures, utility interruptions or other similar necessary events, limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.

Air Quality

Construction for this project is expected to add temporarily particulates to the air that will result in a slight increase in auto-generated air contaminants from construction activities, equipment and worker vehicles; however, this increase is not anticipated to be significant. Federal auto emission controls are the primary means of mitigating air quality impacts from motor vehicles as stated in the Air Quality Policy (Section 25.05.675 SMC). To mitigate impacts of exhaust fumes on the directly adjacent residential uses, trucks hauling materials to and from the project site will not be allowed to queue on streets under windows of the nearby residential buildings.

Should asbestos be identified on the site, it must be removed in accordance with the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) and City requirements. PSCAA regulations require control of fugitive dust to protect air quality and require permits for removal of asbestos during demolition. In order to ensure that PSCAA will be notified of the proposed demolition, a condition will be included pursuant to SEPA authority under SMC 25.05.675A which requires that a copy of the PSCAA permit be attached to the demolition permit, prior to issuance. This will assure proper handling and disposal of asbestos.

Earth

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code requires preparation of a soils report to evaluate the site conditions and provide recommendations for safe construction on sites where grading will involve cuts or fills of greater than three feet in height or grading greater than 100 cubic yards of material.

The soils report, construction plans, and shoring of excavations as needed, will be reviewed by the DPD Geo-technical Engineer and Building Plans Examiner who will require any additional soils-related information, recommendations, declarations, covenants and bonds as necessary to assure safe grading and excavation. This project constitutes a "large project" under the terms of the SGDCC (SMC 22.802.015 D). As such, there are many additional requirements for erosion control including a provision for implementation of best management practices and a requirement for incorporation of an engineered erosion control plan which will be reviewed jointly by the DPD building plans examiner and geo-technical engineer prior to issuance of the permit.

The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code provides extensive conditioning authority and prescriptive construction methodology to assure safe construction techniques are used; therefore, no additional conditioning is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Grading

Excavation to construct the mixed use structure will be necessary. The maximum depth of the excavation is approximately 28 feet and will consist of an estimated 22,500 cubic yards of material. The soil removed will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site by trucks. City code (SMC 11.74) provides that material hauled in trucks not be spilled during transport. The City requires that a minimum of one foot of "freeboard" (area from level of

material to the top of the truck container) be provided in loaded uncovered trucks which minimize the amount of spilled material and dust from the truck bed enroute to or from a site. Future phases of construction will be subject to the same regulations. No further conditioning of the grading/excavation element of the project is warranted pursuant to SEPA policies.

Construction Impacts

Construction activities including construction worker commutes, truck trips, the operation of construction equipment and machinery, and the manufacture of the construction materials themselves result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant.

Traffic and Parking

Duration of construction of the apartment building may last approximately 18 months. During construction, parking demand will increase due to additional demand created by construction personnel and equipment. It is the City's policy to minimize temporary adverse impacts associated with construction activities and parking (SMC 25.05.675 B and M). Parking utilization along streets in the vicinity is near capacity and the demand for parking by construction workers during construction could reduce the supply of parking in the vicinity. Due to the large scale of the project, this temporary demand on the on-street parking in the vicinity due to construction workers' vehicles may be adverse. In order to minimize adverse impacts, the applicant will need to provide a construction worker parking plan to reduce on-street parking until the new garage is constructed and safe to use. The authority to impose this condition is found in Section 25.05.675B2g of the Seattle SEPA Ordinance.

The construction of the project also will have adverse impacts on both vehicular and pedestrian traffic in the vicinity of the project site. During construction a temporary increase in traffic volumes to the site will occur, due to travel to the site by construction workers and the transport of construction materials. Approximately 22,500 cubic yards of soil are expected to be excavated from the project site. The soil removed for the garage structure will not be reused on the site and will need to be disposed off-site. Excavation and fill activity will require approximately 2,250 round trips with 10-yard hauling trucks or 1,125 round trips with 20-yard hauling trucks. Considering the large volumes of truck trips anticipated during construction, it is reasonable that truck traffic avoid the afternoon peak hours. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.

Compliance with Seattle's Street Use Ordinance is expected to mitigate any additional adverse impacts to traffic which would be generated during construction of this proposal.

Long-term Impacts

Long-term or use-related impacts are also anticipated as a result of approval of this proposal including: increased surface water runoff due to greater site coverage by impervious surfaces; increased bulk and scale on the site; increased traffic in the area; increased demand for parking; and increased light and glare.

Several adopted City codes and/or ordinances provide mitigation for some of the identified impacts. Specifically these are: The Stormwater, Grading and Drainage Control Code which requires on site collection of stormwater with provisions for controlled tightline release to an approved outlet and may require additional design elements to prevent isolated flooding; the City Energy Code which will require insulation for outside walls and energy efficient windows; and the Land Use Code which controls site coverage, setbacks, building height and use and contains other development and use regulations to assure compatible development. Compliance with these applicable codes and ordinances is adequate to achieve sufficient mitigation of most long-term impacts and no further conditioning is warranted by SEPA policies. However, due to the size and location of this proposal, green house gas emissions, traffic, parking impacts and public view protection warrant further analysis.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational activities, primarily vehicular trips associated with the project and the project's energy consumption, are expected to result in increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions which adversely impact air quality and contribute to climate change and global warming. While these impacts are adverse, they are not expected to be significant.

Historic Preservation

The existing building on the subject site were reviewed by the Department of Neighborhoods and determined that it is unlikely, due in part to a loss of integrity, that the existing structures would meet the standards for designation as an individual landmark.

Traffic and Transportation

The proposed apartment development would produce approximately 720 new daily vehicular trips, with 71 week day, PM peak hour trips. The addition of the residential building would not cause nearby intersections and the site access to degrade to an unsatisfactory level of service. All off-site study intersections would operate at the same Level of Service (LOS) as a future without project conditions with minimal increases in average vehicle delay caused by adding project related trips to the roadway network.

No SEPA mitigation of traffic impacts to the nearby intersections is warranted.

Parking

Seattle Municipal Code does not require any residential parking to be provided in the Fremont Hub Urban Village. Based on a vehicle ownership rate of 0.96 vehicles per dwelling unit, the peak demand is estimated to be 164 vehicles to occur during overnight periods. With a proposed supply of 130 on-site parking stalls, it is anticipated that a parking spillover of approximately 34 vehicles could occur. An on-street parking analysis conducted by the applicant's consultant, Transpo Group, indicates that the existing on-street parking rate (on the evening of August 21, 2012) totals roughly 63 percent. The addition of 34 more people parking would increase the on-street parking percent to 72 percent, a figure lower than the 85 percent that DPD consider on-street parking to be full.

Summary

In conclusion, several adverse effects on the environment are anticipated resulting from the proposal, which are anticipated to be non-significant. The conditions imposed below are intended to mitigate construction impacts identified in the foregoing analysis, or to control impacts not regulated by codes or ordinances, per adopted City policies.

DECISION - SEPA

This decision was made after review by the responsible official on behalf of the lead agency of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the responsible department. This constitutes the Threshold Determination and form. The intent of this declaration is to satisfy the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (RCW 43.21C), including the requirement to inform the public agency decisions pursuant to SEPA.

- [X] Determination of Non-Significance. This proposal has been determined to not have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is not required under RCW 43.21C.030 2C.
- [] Determination of Significance. This proposal has or may have a significant adverse impact upon the environment. An EIS is required under RCW 43.21C.030 2C.

CONDITIONS – DESIGN REVIEW

Prior to MUP Issuance

Revise plans sets to show:

1. Revise the metal canopy that sits above the primary residential entry. The land use planner has the responsibility to review and approve changes to the design in keeping with Board guidance.
2. Pare the Woodland Park elevation down to its essence. Reassert the façade's strong organization by consolidating (and eliminating colors), revising the metal canopy at the primary residential entrance, and strengthening the visual presence of the glulams.
3. Revise the fenestration for the live/work units in order to visually emphasize the commercial nature of these units. The glazing should not resemble the residential units. Refer to the appendix of the Recommendation packet (p. 13) for the previous design.
4. In keeping with the project's high quality of design, the landscape containers on the roof garden should be of a high quality. Do not use the large metal planters that resemble horse troughs.

Prior to Building Application

5. Include the departure matrix in the zoning summary section on all subsequent building permit plans. Add call-out notes on appropriate plan and elevation drawings in the updated MUP plans and on all subsequent building permit plans.

Prior to Commencement of Construction

6. Arrange a pre-construction meeting with the building contractor, building inspector, and land use planner to discuss expectations and details of the Design Review component of the project.

Prior to Issuance of all Construction Permits

7. Embed the MUP conditions in the cover sheet for all subsequent permits including updated building permit drawings.

Prior to Issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

8. Compliance with all images and text on the MUP drawings, design review meeting guidelines and approved design features and elements (including exterior materials, landscaping and ROW improvements) shall be verified by the DPD planner assigned to this project (Bruce P. Rips, 206.615-1392). An appointment with the assigned Land Use Planner must be made at least three (3) working days in advance of field inspection. The Land Use Planner will determine whether submission of revised plans is required to ensure that compliance has been achieved.

For the Life of the Project

9. Any proposed changes to the exterior of the building or the site or must be submitted to DPD for review and approval by the Land Use Planner (Bruce Rips, 206.615-1392). Any proposed changes to the improvements in the public right-of-way must be submitted to DPD and SDOT for review and for final approval by SDOT.

CONDITIONS – SEPA

Prior to Issuance of a Demolition, Grading, or Building Permit

10. Provide a construction worker parking plan with the intent to reduce on-street parking.
11. Attach a copy of the PSCAA demolition permit to the building permit set of plans.

During Construction

12. Grading, delivery and pouring of concrete and similar noisy activities will be prohibited on Saturdays and Sundays. In addition to the Noise Ordinance requirements, to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby residences, only the low noise impact work such as that listed below, will be permitted on Saturdays from 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M:
 - A. Surveying and layout.
 - B. Testing and tensioning P. T. (post tensioned) cables, requiring only hydraulic equipment (no cable cutting allowed).
 - C. Other ancillary tasks to construction activities will include site security, surveillance, monitoring, and maintenance of weather protecting, water dams and heating equipment.

13. In addition to the Noise Ordinance, requirements to reduce the noise impact of construction on nearby properties, all construction activities shall be limited to the following:
 - A. Non-holiday weekdays between 7:00 A.M and 6:00 P.M.
 - B. Non-holiday weekdays between 6:00 P.M. and 8:00 P.M limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
 - C. Saturdays between 9:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
 - D. Emergencies or work which must be done to coincide with street closures, utility interruptions or other similar necessary events, limited to quieter activities based on a DPD approved mitigation plan and public notice program outlined in the plan.
14. Large (greater than two-axle) trucks will be prohibited from entering or exiting the site after 3:30 PM.
15. Non-noisy activities, such as site security, monitoring, weather protection shall not be limited by this condition.

Compliance with all applicable conditions must be verified and approved by the Land Use Planner, Bruce Rips, (206-615-1392) at the specified development stage, as required by the Director's decision. The Land Use Planner shall determine whether the condition requires submission of additional documentation or field verification to assure that compliance has been achieved.

Signature: (signature on file)
Bruce P. Rips, AAIA, AICP
Department of Planning and Development

Date: December 27, 2012